

REMARKS

All of the claims except claims 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Monin et al. (US 2002/0197984). Claims 17 and 24 were not rejected nor were they allowed. The status of these claims is unclear.

Regarding the Finality of the Rejection, the applicant respectfully requests that the finality be removed and that these amendments be considered. There are two reasons. First, this action does not address claims 17 and 24 and thus the applicant is not able to fully prepare a response. If these claims are allowable, the response may differ. Second, as the examiner noted in the Final Office action, Figure 2 of Monin et was referenced for support of the arguments though the examiner meant to reference Figure 5. Accordingly, the applicant's response was based on an erroneous arguments in support of a rejection. Thus, the applicant requests that the present amendments be considered and that a subsequent action be issued that also addresses claims 17 and 24.

Each of the independent claims herein require a single WLAN device that has a single baseband processor that is operable to communicate through a plurality of radios and a plurality of baseband processor interfaces. With reference to the specific teachings cited in the official action:

Regarding the prior art reference to Monin et al., Figure 2 is a diagram of a "network 22" that includes a plurality of access points 26. Thus, AP1 and AP2 are separate access points (i.e., separate WLAN devices). Thus, Figure 2 does not show multiple radios within a single access point or WLAN device with a single baseband processor. It shows a baseband module and a radio module, but nothing there between as, for example, is shown in Figure 4B of the present application that shows a plurality of radio interfaces but only one baseband processor. The same arguments apply to claim 22. Similarly, Figures 3-7 of Monin et al. show a plurality of baseband modules.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact James Harrison at (214) 902-8100.

Respectfully submitted,
GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON

Dated: August 20, 2008

/James A. Harrison/Reg. No. 40,401

James A. Harrison

Garlick Harrison & Markison
P. O. Box 160727
Austin, TX 78716-0727
Voice: (214) 902-8100
Fax: (214) 902-8101